



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/522,095	01/24/2005	Michael Puhl	3165-117	7566

6449 7590 08/21/2009
ROTHWELL, FIGG, ERNST & MANBECK, P.C.
1425 K STREET, N.W.
SUITE 800
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

QAZI, SABIHA NAIM

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1612

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

08/21/2009

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTO-PAT-Email@rfem.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/522,095

Applicant(s)

PUHL ET AL.

Examiner

Sabiha Qazi

Art Unit

1612

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 6/4/09.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 14-19 and 21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 14-19, 21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CDC)
- Paper No(s) Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s) Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Final Office Action

Claims 1-9, 14-19 and 21 are pending. No claim is allowed. Amendments are entered.

1. Information Disclosure Statement
2. Copending Applications
3. Specification
4. 35 USC § 112(1) Rejections
5. Response to Remarks
6. Conclusion
7. Communication

Information Disclosure Statement

The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609.04(a) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered.

Copending Applications

Applicants must bring to the attention of the examiner, or other Office official involved with the examination of a particular application, information within their knowledge as to other copending United States applications, which are "material to patentability" of the application in question. MPEP 2001.06(b). See *Dayco Products Inc. v. Total Containment Inc.*, 66 USPQ2d 1801 (CA FC 2003).

Specification

The specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-9 and 14-19 and 21 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for the compounds when R7 and R8 are non heterocyclic groups (as has been exemplified by pyrimidine compounds, example 1 on page 58) does not reasonably provide enablement for the large number of compounds when R7 and R8 together with the nitrogen atom to which they are attached form a saturated or unsaturated 3-, 4-, 5-, 6 or 7-membered nitrogen heterocyclic which may optionally contain one or two further heteroatoms selected from the group consisting of nitrogen, sulfur and oxygen as ring members, which may contain 1 or 2 carbonyl and/or thiocarbonyl groups as ring members.

R22 and R23 together with the atoms to which they are attached form a 5-, 6- or 7-membered saturated or unsaturated ring which may contain a heteroatom selected from the group consisting of oxygen and nitrogen as a ring-forming atom. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

The level of predictability in the art: There is no guidance in the specification how to make and use the invention of the compounds of formula (1) especially when R7 and R8 or R22 and 23 can be wide range of 5-7 membered saturated or unsaturated ring heterocyclic rings which may contain a heteroatom selected from the group consisting of oxygen and nitrogen as a ring-forming atom.

The synthesis of such a large variety of compounds having different structures and so different chemical properties cannot be predicted. Even when similar starting materials are used under the same conditions the products obtained are different.

As stated in the preface to a recent treatise:

“Most non-chemists would probably be horrified if they were to learn how many attempted syntheses fail, and how inefficient research

chemists are. The ratio of successful to unsuccessful chemical experiments in a normal research laboratory is far below unity, and synthetic research chemists, in the same way as most scientists, spend most of their time working out what went wrong, and why. Despite the many pitfalls lurking in organic synthesis, most organic chemistry textbooks and research articles do give the impression that organic reactions just proceed smoothly and that the total synthesis of complex natural products, for instance, is maybe a labor- intensive but otherwise undemanding task. In fact, most syntheses of structurally complex natural products are the result of several years of hard work by a team of chemists, with almost every step requiring careful optimization. The final synthesis usually looks quite different from that originally planned, because of unexpected difficulties encountered in the initially chosen synthetic sequence. Only the seasoned practitioner who has experienced for himself the many failures and frustrations which the development (sometimes even the repetition) of a synthesis usually implies will be able to appraise such work..... Chemists tend not to publish negative results, because these are, as opposed to positive results, never definite (and far too

copious)". Dorwald F. A. Side Reactions in Organic Synthesis, 2005,
Wiley: VCH, Weinheim pg. IX of Preface (reference enclosed).

Thus synthesis of these compounds of the compounds of formula I containing heterocyclic groups as cited above is unpredictable.

The amount of direction provided by the inventor: The inventor provides very little direction in the instant specification. Only limited substituents on the compounds are made and disclosed. There is no preparation of compounds of formula (1) when R7 and R8 or R22 and 23 can be wide range of 5-7 membered saturated or unsaturated ring heterocyclic rings which may contain a heteroatom selected from the group consisting of oxygen and nitrogen as a ring-forming atom. The availability of the starting material that is needed to prepare the invention as claimed is also at issue here. As per MPEP 2164.01 (b): A key issue that can arise when determining whether the specification is enabling is whether the starting materials or apparatus necessary to make the invention are available. The Court in In re Ghiron, 442 F.2d 985,991,169 USPQ 723,727 (CCPA 1971), made clear that if the practice of a method requires a particular apparatus, the application must provide a sufficient disclosure of the apparatus if the apparatus is not readily

available. The same can be said if certain chemicals are required to make a compound or practice a chemical process. In re Howarth, 654 F.2d 103, 105,210 USPQ 689, 691 (CCPA 1981). There are no starting materials provided with respect to the various substituents.

The amount of direction or guidance provided and the presence or absence of working examples

The specification provides no direction or guidance for practicing the claimed invention in its “full scope”. No reasonable specific guidance is provided. The instant specification does not have any working examples with respect to the various substituents as given above. The state of the art indicates that even when the reactants are similar, and the reaction conditions are the same, it is not necessary that it would form the same products.

The instant disclosure provides no evidence to suggest that this unit dose as claimed can be extrapolated to tumors having unrelated mechanisms of resistance, and thus does not meet the “how to use” prong of 35 USC 112, first paragraph with regard thereto.

The only compounds disclosed in the specification are when R1 is

pyrimidine and R7 and R8 are lower alkyl group.

The quantity of experimentation necessary

Because of the known unpredictability of the art, and in the absence of experimental evidence, no one skilled in the art would accept the assertion that the instantly claimed compounds could be predictably made and use as inferred by the claim and contemplated by the specification. Accordingly, the instant claims do not comply with the enablement requirement of §112, since to practice the claimed invention in its “full scope” a person of ordinary skill in the art would have to engage in undue experimentation, with no assurance of success.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112-Written Description

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 1-9, 14-19 and 21 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to

reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Following reasons apply:

In claim 1 formula I, contains large number of heterocyclic for example substituents when R7 and R8 together with the nitrogen atom to which they are attached form a saturated or unsaturated 3-, 4-, 5-, 6 or 7-membered nitrogen heterocyclic which may optionally contain one or two further heteroatoms selected from the group consisting of nitrogen, sulfur and oxygen as ring members, which may contain 1 or 2 carbonyl and/or thiocarbonyl groups as ring members.

3. R22 and R23 together with the atoms to which they are attached form a 5-, 6- or 7-membered saturated or unsaturated ring which may contain a heteroatom selected from the group consisting of oxygen and nitrogen as a ring-forming atom.
4. The specification discloses the compounds when R7 and R8 are non heterocyclic groups (as has been exemplified by pyrimidine compounds, example 1 on page 58). There is no guidance and/or description of the large number of compounds to prepare and use them.
5. It appears that at the time the invention was filed Applicants have no possession of all the invention as has been claimed. Applicant is requested to kindly explain this issue.

6. The description requirement of the patent statute requires a description of an invention, not an indication of a result that one might achieve if one made that invention. See, e.g., In re Wilder, 22 USPQ 369, 372-3 (Fed. Cir. 1984). (Holding that a claim was not adequately described because the specification did ‘little more than outline goals appellants hope the claimed invention achieves and the problems the invention will hopefully ameliorate.’)

Conversely, a description of a chemical genus will usually comprise a recitation of structural features common to the members of the genus, which features constitute a substantial portion of the genus. See Univ. of Calf. V. Eli Lilly, 43 USPQ 2d 1398, 1406 (Fed. Cir. 1997). This is analogous to enablement of a genus under Section 112, ¶ 1, by showing the enablement of a representative number of species within the genus.

A chemical genus can be adequately described if the disclosure presents a sufficient number of representative species that encompass the genus. *If the genus has substantial variance, the disclosure must describe a sufficient number of species to reflect the variation within that genus.* See MPEP 2163. The MPEP lists factors that can be used to determine if sufficient evidence of possession has been furnished in the disclosure of the Application. These include the level of skill and knowledge in the art, partial structure, physical and/or chemical properties,

functional characteristics alone or coupled with a known or disclosed correlation between structure and function, and the method of making the claimed invention. Disclosure of any *combination of such identifying characteristics that distinguish the claimed invention from other materials* and would lead one of skill in the art to the conclusion that the applicant was in possession of the claimed species is sufficient. MPEP 2163.

Here, the specification does not provide a reasonably representative disclosure of useful [for example controlling unwanted vegetation] generally, a potentially huge genus inclusive of many different compounds having widely divergent structures and functions. Specifically, the specification discloses only a limited number of species and these are not viewed as being reasonably representative of the genus in its claimed scope which includes derivatives of the compounds of formula (I) because no readily apparent combination of identifying characteristics is provided, other than the disclosure of those specific species as examples of the claimed genus.

Response to Remarks

Rejections not reiterated from previous office actions are hereby withdrawn. The following rejections are either reiterated or newly applied. They constitute the complete set presently being applied to the instant application. Applicants have elected election of group I. Examiner has combined all six membered heterocyclic rings in one group even though they are structurally very different, for example pyridine is different from pyrimidine.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Communication

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sabiha Qazi whose telephone number is (571) 272-0622. The examiner can normally be reached on any business day except Wednesday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Krass Frederick can be reached on (571) 272-0580. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Sabiha Qazi/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1612